

Application No. 10/660,836
Response to OA of 06/20/2005

Remarks

Claims 1-20 are presented for examination. No new matter is entered.

I. Claims Rejection: 35 USC § 103(a)

Claims 1 – 20 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,282,082 (Armitage) in view of USPN 5,627,450 (Ryan). Applicant respectfully traverses.

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art cited must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. See M.P.E.P. § 2143. Applicant asserts that the rejection does not satisfy these criteria.

Claim 1

Claim 1 recites numerous recitations that are not taught or suggested in Armitage in view of Ryan. For example, claim 1 recites "wherein the support mechanism comprises a movable foot and a fixed resilient bumper" (emphasis added). Nowhere does Armitage in view of Ryan teach or suggest both a movable foot and a fixed resilient bumper.

In Armitage, "FIG. 16 depicts tablet computer system 800 supported on support surface 1602 by the two mini-stands depicted in FIG. 9" (col. 14, lines 23-25). Armitage does not teach or suggest a fixed resilient bumper. In fact, Armitage does not even teach or suggest any bumpers.

In Ryan, FIGS. 4 and 7 teach legs 28 that pivot to move the base to a tilt position (see col. 3, lines 33-62). The outer surface of legs 28 provides shock absorption. In Ryan, however, the shock absorbing layer forms part of the leg. The Office Action even admits this teaching: "Ryan et al. also teaches the bumper (outer surface of element 28) providing shock absorption ..." (see OA at p. 3). The bumper and leg in Ryan both

Application No. 10/650,836
Response to OA of 06/20/2005

move. By contrast, claim 1 recites that the support mechanism comprises a movable foot and a fixed resilient bumper.

Thus, Armitage and Ryan fail to teach or suggest all the recitations in claim 1. For at least these reasons, claim 1 is allowable over Armitage in view of Ryan.

A dependent claim inherits the recitations of a base claim. Thus, for at least the reasons given in connection with independent claim 1, the dependent claims depending from claim 1 are also allowable over Armitage in view of Ryan.

Claim 8

Claim 8 recites numerous recitations that are not taught or suggested in Armitage in view of Ryan. For example, claim 8 recites "a support mechanism connected to the base and comprising a resilient bumper separated from and adjacent to a foot" (emphasis added). Nowhere does Armitage in view of Ryan teach or suggest a resilient bumper separated from and adjacent to a foot.

In Armitage, "FIG. 16 depicts tablet computer system 800 supported on support surface 1602 by the two mini-stands depicted in FIG. 9" (col. 14, lines 23-25). Armitage does not teach or suggest a resilient bumper. In fact, Armitage does not even teach or suggest any bumpers.

In Ryan, FIGS. 4 and 7 teach legs 28 that pivot to move the base to a tilt position (see col. 3, lines 33-62). The outer surface of legs 28 provides shock absorption. In Ryan, however, the shock absorbing layer forms part of the leg. The Office Action even admits this teaching: "Ryan et al. also teaches the bumper (outer surface of element 28) providing shock absorption ..." (see OA at p. 3). The bumper and leg in Ryan both move. By contrast, claim 8 recites that the support mechanism comprises a resilient bumper separated from and adjacent to a foot.

Thus, Armitage and Ryan fail to teach or suggest all the recitations in claim 8. For at least these reasons, claim 8 is allowable over Armitage in view of Ryan.

A dependent claim inherits the recitations of a base claim. Thus, for at least the reasons given in connection with independent claim 8, the dependent claims depending from claim 8 are also allowable over Armitage in view of Ryan.

Application No. 10/660,836
Response to OA of 05/20/2005

Claim 13

Claim 13 recites numerous recitations that are not taught or suggested in Armitage in view of Ryan. For example, claim 13 recites "transmitting force applied to the computer from a movable foot to a **fixed resilient bumper** ..." (emphasis added). Nowhere does Armitage in view of Ryan teach or suggest both a movable foot and a fixed resilient bumper.

In Armitage, "FIG. 16 depicts tablet computer system 800 supported on support surface 1602 by the two mini-stands depicted in FIG. 9" (col. 14, lines 23-25). Armitage does not teach or suggest a fixed resilient bumper. In fact, Armitage does not even teach or suggest any bumpers.

In Ryan, FIGS. 4 and 7 teach legs 28 that pivot to move the base to a tilt position (see col. 3, lines 33-62). The outer surface of legs 28 provides shock absorption. In Ryan, however, the shock absorbing layer forms part of the leg. The Office Action even admits this teaching: "Ryan et al. also teaches the bumper (outer surface of element 28) providing shock absorption ..." (see OA at p. 3). The bumper and leg in Ryan both move. By contrast, claim 13 recites that the support mechanism comprises a movable foot and a fixed resilient bumper.

Thus, Armitage and Ryan fail to teach or suggest all the recitations in claim 13. For at least these reasons, claim 13 is allowable over Armitage in view of Ryan.

A dependent claim inherits the recitations of a base claim. Thus, for at least the reasons given in connection with independent claim 13, the dependent claims depending from claim 13 are also allowable over Armitage in view of Ryan.

Claim 18

Claim 18 recites numerous recitations that are not taught or suggested in Armitage in view of Ryan. For example, claim 18 recites "wherein the means for absorbing is **fixed to the back surface and separated from the means for elevating**" (emphasis added). Nowhere does Armitage in view of Ryan teach or suggest that a means for absorbing is fixed to the back surface of a display and separated from a means for elevating the display.

Application No. 10/660,836
Response to OA of 06/20/2005

In Armitage, "FIG. 16 depicts tablet computer system 800 supported on support surface 1602 by the two mini-stands depicted in FIG. 9" (col. 14, lines 23-25). Armitage does not teach or suggest a means for absorbing.

In Ryan, FIGS. 4 and 7 teach legs 28 that pivot to move the base to a tilt position (see col. 3, lines 33-62). The outer surface of legs 28 provides shock absorption. In Ryan, however, the shock absorbing layer forms part of the leg. The Office Action even admits this teaching: "Ryan et al. also teaches the bumper (outer surface of element 28) providing shock absorption ..." (see OA at p. 3). The bumper and leg in Ryan both move. By contrast, claim 18 recites that the means for absorbing is fixed to the back surface of the display and separated from the means for elevating the display.

Thus, Armitage and Ryan fail to teach or suggest all the recitations in claim 18. For at least these reasons, claim 18 is allowable over Armitage in view of Ryan.

A dependent claim inherits the recitations of a base claim. Thus, for at least the reasons given in connection with independent claim 18, the dependent claims depending from claim 18 are also allowable over Armitage in view of Ryan.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Application No. 10/660,836
Response to OA of 06/20/2005

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Applicant believes that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

Any inquiry regarding this Amendment and Response should be directed to Philip S. Lyren at Telephone No. (281) 514-8236, Facsimile No. (281) 514-8332. In addition, all correspondence should continue to be directed to the following address:

Hewlett-Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

Respectfully submitted,



Philip S. Lyren
Reg. No. 40,709
Ph: 281-514-8236

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.8

The undersigned hereby certifies that this paper or papers, as described herein, is being transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office facsimile number 571-273-8300 on this 19th day of September, 2005.

By 
Name: Carrie McKerley